

Robicheau, Vanessa

To: Taylor, Sheree L.
Subject: RE: SCUBE

From: Giuliana Giammarco
Sent: June-11-13 7:34 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: SCUBE

June 5, 2013

Mayor and Members of Council, City of Hamilton

Attention: City Clerk clerk@hamilton.ca

I attended the committee meeting, June 4, 2013 to hear the deliberations on the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan (SCUBE) since I own some lands in the area. I also made a brief presentation identifying myself and my issues to the committee. I was shocked and saddened by some of what transpired. Here is a list of my concerns:

1. I heard a prominent Hamilton lawyer tell the committee that staff found an 'ingenious' way of skirting provincial laws by suggesting a land use along Barton Street which will never materialize. This argument seemed to convince some on the committee, and even its Chair commented on how clever this was. This strategy begs some questions: is staff mandated to avoid following provincial legislation; and what other ingenious skullduggery is contained in the plan accepted by committee?
2. Three residents of Barton Street, whose homes are zoned for School use, tearfully told the committee of their wish not to be expropriated. Committee was indignant that these residents would feel this way and publicly stated that the city does not expropriate. Of course, we all know that the city does have the power to do so; and has done so whenever it feels that public interest is being served. As well, these lands are being zoned for school use. Therefore, the school board has the power of expropriation should it need the lands. Clearly, if a school site is being proposed, the Board will need these properties. This exchange poses a number of questions: a) why guarantee something that may be beyond the city's control? b) Conversely, of what use is zoning lands for school siting if the city knows that this will never occur in the absence of a willing seller? c) Similarly, these homes are also needed for park access. Removing them from the equation in the absence of a willing seller, the park's viability is also diminished. Hence, the location of both the school and the park is rendered incongruous.
3. Several presenters pointed out that the proposed community park is very close to the existing Sherwood Park, also having the community designation. In its presentation staff said it relied on 'a study' which recommended the location. This is the first time I have heard of this study. It had never, to my knowledge, been mentioned at any of the public meetings we attended nor the Community Liaison Committee meetings we participated in. Will the city release this study in its entirety so the public can see exactly what it states? As well, staff designated a community park in this location prior to the city purchasing the former Alliance Church property which enlarges the already large Sherwood Park.
4. At stakeholder meetings organized by Councillor Johnson, as well as at her community meetings, the Councillor publicly stated that she was not happy with a community park in its current location and favoured neighbourhood parks instead. Yet, in the ten hours of meetings yesterday, understandably dominated by questions from the ward councillor, not one reference was made to her publicly stated position. Nor did the

councillor indicate why she may have changed her mind on what she committed to in public. The question I have: What led to the change of heart and mind? Of note is the historical fact that schools close down and when they do, the Boards hold the city to 'ransom' to maintain facilities no longer supported by the school community open. The better strategy is to separate the two uses to make each self-sufficient.

5. I and my partner who own about 20 acres of land in SCUBE asked why 100% of our lands are set aside for public use. 100%. Not 90% or 70% or 50%. But 100%. The question: what are the chances that staff's siting of these uses on our lands was purely coincidental? If so, this coincidence defies credulity especially since the previous 4 plans produced by the CAC were in variance to the one crafted by staff.

6. I am not part of the CAC leadership team, but must agree with their feeling of betrayal. True, they are an advisory group. But they gave two years of their time to the process. If they shouldn't expect to be agreed with 100%, neither should they expect to be ignored 100%. And according to their own testimony yesterday, they certainly feel that way. In fact the staff's fourth and recommended plan came about through questionable and less than public processes.

7. Finally, Councillor Clark asked how all the questions posed yesterday would be addressed and suggested a two-week period to collate and respond. Instead, a councillor suggested it be hurried for the next council meeting. The question: will you honour all those folks who came and followed the process and posed questions which deserve answers? How?

Sincerely,

Giuliana Giammarco